

Report to

WA State Office of Financial Management Grants, Contracts and Loans Feasibility Study

Deliverable Expectations Document – Definition of Requirements





Sierra Systems Inc. 111 Market St NE • Suite 225 Olympia, WA 98501 USA www.SierraSystems.com

Contact: Carol Baque Phone: 360.357.5668 Fax: 360.754.0480

Email: CarolBaque@SierraSystems.com

Date: January 17, 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Approach	1
2.1. Deliverable Responsibility by Document Section	1
3. Assumptions	1
4. Deliverable Schedule	1
5. Deliverable Format	1
6. Acceptance Criteria	1
7 Deliverable Final Annroval	1

Confidentiality/Validity

This document has been prepared by Sierra Systems for the sole purpose and exclusive use of WA State Office of Financial Management. Due to the confidential nature of the material in this document, its contents should not be discussed with, or disclosed to, third parties without the prior written consent of WA State Office of Financial Management.

1. Introduction

The Washington State Department of Ecology must replace its aged Contracts & Grants Management System that processed transactions totaling \$392 million in the 2003-2005 biennium. OFM has proposed that Ecology's replacement be directed into an enterprise system for Washington State to be used by multiple agencies for grants, contracts, and loans management. Benefits are avoidance of duplicative systems costs among agencies, cross-agency monitoring of projects, and improvement of core business practices. OFM is leading the effort, joined by the Departments of Ecology (ECY) and Community, Trade and Economic Development (CTED) as the first customers of the new system. An enterprise system is also mission-critical to CTED; it distributes over \$1.2 billion in new and existing contracts and loans through manual procedures and spreadsheets and seeks improved business practices and information systems.

This document is part of a feasibility study that will allow OFM, ECY and CTED to plan for an enterprise solution for grants, contracts and loans management (within the scope of this project) by documenting:

- The requirements for an enterprise grants, contracts and loans solution
- The business case for proceeding with such a solution
- The alternatives and costs and benefits for a solution and a recommended solution
- For the recommended solution:
 - A conceptual design
 - A work plan
 - A risk management plan

2. APPROACH

The working project team will work on two efforts concurrently:

- Reviewing current requirements-related materials from CTED and ECY and the Roadmap initiative
- Interviewing stakeholders whose requirements have not yet been elicited. Stakeholders include state and federal staff with enterprise interest in grants, contracts and loans information, as well as staff who may enter data into a grants, contracts and loans system.

We will organize functional requirement information gathered into use cases and document them in a use case template. An example of this template, taken from a previous feasibility study and updated for core and agency-specific requirements, is shown below. The items and level of detail completed for this project may vary according to the time and information available.

Technical and other non-functional requirements will also be documented.

Use Case Name	Record an asset		
Use Case Number	2		
Description	Record a new asset of any type. An asset may be land, a building, a vehicle, a firearm, computer hardware, etc.		
Actors	Agency property staff		
Priority	Essential		
Preconditions	User has signed on to asset management system		
	User has permission to add an asset		
	User has the tag number, description and class code of the asset		
Triggers and Frequency	A new asset has been received.		
	Frequency will depend on agency size and use. Range from zero to one per month to 100.		
Normal Process	User requests to add an asset		
	2. System presents a form blank except for agency information		
	3. User fills in the form and indicates complete/save		
	4. System checks business rules and edits		
	5. System stores asset information into a database		
	6. System displays a message of successful add		
Exceptional Process	4. User doesn't have permission to add this fund		
	5. System displays error message		



Use Case Name	Record an asset
	4. User doesn't enter all required fields
	5. System asks if user wants to save info and complete later
	6. If user says yes, system saves info
	7. If user says no, exit use case
	4. System finds edit or business rule error
	5. System displays error message
	5. System error on data store
	System displays system error message
One Business	DO 4 The secretary would allow the secretary and the secretary with
Core Business Requirements/ Priority	R2.1 The system must allow user to enter a new asset by tag number, with the asset description and a class code.
(Essential, High, Low)	Priority: Essential
	R2.2 The system must all entry of incomplete asset information, save it and allow user to complete it later
	Priority: Essential
	R2.3 The system must notify users of incomplete asset entries when they sign on.
	Priority: Essential
	R2.4 The system must be able to restrict adding assets by funds.
	Priority: Essential
	R2.5 The system must be able to use the AFRS table of commodity codes <i>Priority</i> : Essential
	R2.6 The system must be able to use the AFRS table of county codes <i>Priority</i> : Essential
	R2.7 The system must be able to use the AFRS GL fund codes <i>Priority</i> : Essential
	R2.8 The system must allow recording of business rules for adding assets, e.g., a building must have square feet. Priority: Essential
	R2.9 The system must apply business rules to requests to add assets and allow adding/disallow adding based on the business rules. Priority: Essential
	R2.10 The system must record the userid, asset identifer and date/time of add in a change log. Priority: Essential
	R2.11 The system must allow recording user definable fields with an asset. <i>Priority</i> : Essential
Agency-Specific Requirements/ Priority (Essential, High, Low)	

Use Case Name	Record an asset
Post Condition	The asset information has been stored in the database.
Data Items	Tag number, description, class code, location, fund code(s), condition, acquisition date, fund cost, total cost, purchase document number, field order number, fiscal month/biennium paid-for, lease period, lease agent, lease maintenance amount, leased maintenance period, lease restrictions, license number, loaned/not, vendor, manufacturer, manufacturer's serial number, organizational control (division, branch, section, unit, cost center), program index, ownership status (state-owned/capitalized lease/operating lease), quantity, square feet, acres, front footage, agency reference number, use, claim: state/federal/local/combination/other/donated, salvage value, Add facilities items to this list.
	Log info: userid, asset identifier, date/time of add
Notes	A user may not have all asset information handy when adding an asset, e.g., cost.

2.1. Deliverable Responsibility by Document Section

Section	Description	Resp.
Requirements Definition		
Introduction		Baque
Purpose	Purpose of this document	
Background	Brief description of the project, the current business situation and business problems/issues	
Approach	Approach taken to complete this deliverable	
Sources	Sources of information for this deliverable	
Relationship to Other Deliverables	Relationship of this deliverable to others in the project	
Objectives, Constraints and Scope	Re-statement of objectives, constraints and scope from Project Plan	Baque
System Actors	People expected to interact with the system	Baque
Assumptions	Assumptions applying to these requirements	Baque
Prioritized Functional Requirements		Baque
Requirements in the context of use cases	Brief explanation of use cases, or cases in which the system will be used	

Section	Description	Resp.
Enterprise and agency-specific requirements	Explanation of the criteria to decide enterprise and agency-specific requirements	
Priorities and Evaluation	Description of priorities given to requirements	
Use case list	List of use cases, separated by grants, contracts, loans and other functional divisions.	
Individual use case descriptions, including common/specific and priorities	Use case descriptions	
Non-Functional Requirements	Other requirements, including accessibility, usability, security, scalability, reliability	Baque/Wilmot
Technical Requirements	Requirements set by Roadmap goals, ISB enterprise architecture standards (including business architecture, information architecture, and technology architecture), and the OFM operating environment	Baque/Wilmot
Appendix A Revision Log	Log of all revisions to this document	Baque
Appendix B Requirements Interviews and Notes	List of parties interviewed and notes from the interviews	Baque

3. ASSUMPTIONS

All assumptions in the Project Plan were made when determining the expectations of this deliverable.

4. DELIVERABLE SCHEDULE

This schedule includes the review and sign off tasks that are associated with completing this deliverable.

Task	Start Date	Completion Date
Definition of Requirements		2/09/06

5. DELIVERABLE FORMAT

The final deliverable will be a Word document delivered via email.

6. ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA

This section outlines the criteria that must be met in order for this deliverable to be considered complete. Prior to submission of this deliverable to OFM, the following criteria must be met.

- All sections are clear and accurate
- The document has been reviewed for quality by its agreed-upon approvers and has been found satisfactory

7. DELIVERABLE FINAL APPROVAL

The following are the required approvers of this deliverable. Approvers must select one of these dispositions after reviewing it:

- 1. I approve this deliverable and have no further questions or comments.
- 2. I conditionally approve this deliverable, contingent on the corrections below.

Approver: Sharon Novak	Disposition	Date	
Approver: Allen Schmidt	Disposition	Date	
Approver: Carol Baque	Disposition	Date	
Approver: Carol Baque	Disposition	Date	

Comments: